## II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 remain pending.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the examiners indication that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)*

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13-15, 25, and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of US 6,167,255 to Kennedy (Kennedy).

Claim 1 recites "a host configured to receive the ready control signal and produce a control signal in response thereto...a switch circuit which selectively couples one of the host and the external computer to the telecommunications device in response to the control signal from the host."

The examiner stated in the previous Office Action that Mikiya does not teach the external computer providing a ready control signal. Rather, the examiner contends that the ready control signal is inherently produced and supported column 8, lines 5-10 and column 7, lines 57-62. However, these paragraphs only mention broadly that a network exists between the components. Nothing in Kennedy teaches or suggests that the ready control

signal originates with the external computer. Further, nothing in either reference teaches the switch being responsive to a control signal that is generated in response to the ready control signal. Since Kennedy is silent and provides no indication as to the generation of the ready control signal, applicants suggest that a *prima facia* case for obviousness has not been established by the examiner. "The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facia* conclusion of obviousness." MPEP §2142. The examiner has not provided factual support that the subject matter of claim 1 would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art. "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." Ex parte, Clapp, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Since Mikiya does not teach or suggest the external computer providing a ready control signal and Kennedy is altogether silent regarding the origination of the ready control signal, the combination of Mikiya and Kennedy cannot teach or suggest the present invention according to claim 1.

Claims 4, 6, and 7 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Claim 9 recites "the external computer being configured to provide a ready control signal to the connector". Claim 25 recites "a first computer, originating a ready control signal". In addition, claim 27 includes "transmitting

a predetermined code from the detachable external computer to the host". Accordingly, the arguments applied to claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 9, 25, and 27. Again, applicants submit that the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facia* case of obviousness since the examiner has not provided any teaching that the external computer originates the ready control signal or a predetermined code.

Claims 13-15, 28 and 29 depend from claims 9, 25, and 27 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claims 9, 25, and 27.

Claims 2, 8, 16-20, 26, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of Kennedy.

Claim 17 recites "detecting a ready control signal from the external computer". Therefore, the arguments applied to claim 1 are also applicable to claim 17. Claims 2, 8, 16, 18-20, 26, and 30 depend from claims 1, 9, 17, 25, or 27, and are, therefore, patentable for the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1, 9, 18, 25, and 27.

Claims 5, 10-12, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of Kennedy and further in view of EIA/ITA 232 standard.

Claims 5, 10-12, and 22-24 depend from claims 1, 9, or 17 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claims 1, 9, and 17.

*Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: May 16, 2006

Robert K. Fergan
Reg. No.: 51,674
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000